DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 557 SP 019 145

AUTHOR Scott, Robert A.
TITLE Teacher Education: Tomorrow's Impact.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators of Indiana (Turkey Run, IN, October 19, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); *Declining Enrollment; *Educational Trends; Higher Education; *Program Development; Resource Allocation; Retrenchment; *Schools of Education; Student Motivation; *Teacher Education; Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Supply and Demand

ABSTRACT

In discussing the future of teacher education, several factors can be considered. The control of teacher education is exercised by college and university faculty, professional associations, government agencies, and accreditation groups. In preservice and inservice teacher education, there is a need for more discipline-based study and clinical internships, broader advisory councils, increased college education faculty involvement with school classrooms, and higher admission standards for entry into teacher education. Anticipated changes in the field of teacher education are in the areas of enrollment patterns, reallocation of resources, accreditation standards, and the supply and demand of teachers. New incentives for students and programs are needed. These can be in the areas of specialized grants or loan forgiveness, incentives to discontinue or consolidate unneeded programs, allocation of resources to high priority areas, leadership development, cooperation between schools and colleges, and attracting new persons to teaching. The new priorities for teacher education should include attention to learning research and basic school curriculum. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED212557

# TEACHER EDUCATION:
# TOMORROW'S IMPACT

Dr. Robert A. Scott
Director of Academic Affairs
Indiana Commission for Higher Education

A Presentation at the Annual Meeting
of the Association of Teacher Educators of Indiana
October 19, 1981, Turkey Run, Indiana

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert A. Scott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 019 145

TEACHER EDUCATION:
TOMORROW'S IMPACT

Robert A. Scott

I have been asked to consider four topics:

1. The impact of the Commission for Higher Education on teacher education
2. The changes in the control of teacher education I would like to see
3. The changes in the nature of teacher education I would like to see
4. My crystal ball estimates about teacher education in the future

While this assignment is more than enough to fill the time I have, I want to add two more topics--or at least add two dimensions to the topics already listed. These new topics are:

5. The need for incentives for improvement in teacher education, and
6. Some new priorities for teacher education.

To begin, I want to make it clear that I think teacher education is important--because I think teachers are important. But you will note in my comments that I may have a broader view of teaching and of teachers than some others. In my view, teachers are not just educators of young people assigned to special buildings; they are specialists trained in the organization and transmission of knowledge in ways that take into account the social and mental development of those who are learners.

1. The CHE - 1971 - forms of <u>impact</u>

-budget recommendations--Quality Improvement and Program Change
-program review--new and existing
-statewide academic planning--needs for education and
opportunities for service

2. Any question about changes in the <u>control</u> of teacher education raises the question of who controls teacher education, which I am sure you understand better than I do. But there are still some observations I would offer which might be of interest. The major controls on the preparation of professionals in any field are exercised by <u>current professionals</u> on college and university faculties, in membership associations, in government agencies responsible for licensure and regulation, and in accreditation groups. This long list makes it sound as if many separate controls exist, but that can be misleading because in most cases the leaders of these groups are drawn from the profession. And teachers, like most professionals, and teacher education control groups, like most professional control groups, tend to be motivated by self interest, not service to society. But I do not recommend a change in the form of controls on teacher education--I only offer a comment. Remember that your client is not the profession, but society.

3. When it comes to possible changes in the nature of teacher education itself, I will be a bit more bold--and more specific.

There is need, I think, for

-more preparation in professional responsibilities with regard to collective bargaining. Don't leave it to those who have vested interests in adversial positions

-more discipline-based study--in the subject matter to be taught and in human development

-more clinical internships and better designed practice teaching assignments

-more inservice education for employed teachers

-more advisory councils comprised of parents, community leaders, and business executives, in addition to teacher educators and teachers

-ensuring that college faculty in teacher education programs spend more time in elementary and secondary classrooms

-reducing enrollments and raising admission standards for entry into teacher education, and graduating fewer but higher ability and better prepared teachers
-anticipate future declines

-recognize the drop nationally from 20% to 5% of college students planning to become teachers during the past decade

-recognizing that dipping further into the applicant pool will only damage the profession and reduce the quality of service it can provide

4. Crystal ball estimates are always risky. Nevertheless, there are some changes which seem fairly certain.

-the decline in college enrollments and the increase in professional opportunities for women suggest that the number of

education students and teacher education graduates will continue to decline

-the need for resources by means of reallocation will result in the closure of relatively weak programs--i.e., programs which are weak in terms of enrollments and student quality

-the pressures on teacher education programs will lead to increased uncertainty in the profession, and could result in major changes in accreditation standards, in licensing and certification requirements, and in who prepares teachers

-the absolute shortage of teachers, and mismatches in the supply and demand of teachers, could lead to new incentives for attracting persons into the teaching profession

Thus, my desire to comment on the need for new incentives and for new priorities. First, incentives. We need new incentives for students and for programs. For example,

-specialized grants or loan forgiveness as incentives for students to enter high need teaching areas--math and science, elementary education, preschool and kindergarten, and other selected areas of secondary education

-We have had loan forgiveness for teachers before, and now have it for physicians and nurses. Before long we may have it for soldiers.

-incentives for colleges and universities to discontinue or consolidate unneeded programs

-use program review as a vehicle to rethink the core of teacher education and reallocate resources to hig' priority areas

-incentives for developing leaders--most studies show the importance of the school principal in the establishment and maintenance of a climate for good teaching

-incentives for schools and colleges to work together on developing internships, remediation efforts, and vocational education programs

-incentives to attract new persons to teaching and to make it possible for them to gain certification by studying during summers and at other convenient times

-incentives for coordination among state boards responsible for elementary education, secondary education, vocational-technical education, and post-secondary education in the

  -review of programs
  -continuing education for teachers
  -coordination of accreditation reviews
  -establishment of new research agendas

5. Which brings me to my final topic--the establishment of new priorities for teacher education. This is not to say that what I have suggested already does not refer to priorities. Rather, I want to draw attention to several particular points.

-We need increased research efforts in the area of learning--both basic research by age group and increased efforts to improve the public's understanding of learning. Advances in biology and psychology are promising, but more effort is needed.

-We need to know more about the basic school curriculum. As Harry Passow of Teachers College-Columbia has said, "Only implicitly [are] the basic curricular questions tackled--what should be taught, to whom, when, how, under what circumstances, by whom using what resources, and evaluated in what fashion." (Secondary Education Reform: Restropect and Prospect, 1976, pp. 51-52.)

There are many projects designed to study these questions, and the answers are of great importance to preservice, inservice, and continuing education activities for teachers. We need renewed attention to the mission of teacher education programs. What is their purpose? Who shall decide?

In conclusion, I want to repeat my admonition to be clear about who your most important client is and to involve more than only teachers and teacher educators in designing programs. To help make my point, I offer two quotes. The first is by George F. Kennan (Atlantic Monthly, January 1981) who is speaking about the respective failures of the U.S. and Russia in their approach to teenage youth:

> "Neither system finds itself able to provide them with the leadership and inspiration and guidance needed to realize their potential as individuals to meet the responsibilities the future is inevitably going to place upon them."

Next, Sharon Franz of the Ford Foundation is quoted by Harold Howe, in the Summer 1981 issue of College Board Review, as saying:

> Elementary teachers, with all of their frustrations, have a pretty good idea of what they are preparing kids for--more of the same. How could a secondary school teacher possibly know what these kids need to prepare them for a world that is changing so rapidly? My best guess is that if educators are really serious about preparing these young people to take a place in the world of work and responsibility, then they (the educators) must learn more about how that world operates. In short, build those linkages with the community, industry, bureaucracy--all the institutions with which an adult has to interact for the remainder of his life. It is up to educational leadership to instill faith and a belief in the benefits of cooperation and shared responsibility for these kids in the minds of parents and teachers. Otherwise youth culture will continue to build out of control. I am afraid that without some stronger arguments for why these educational leaders must begin a school improvement effort involving parents, teachers, community leaders, and civic, business, and industry types, there is little hope for the future of the American High School.

The public expects such action and equates it with quality. They expect cooperation between programs, program levels, and institutions; they expect imagination and integrity in the design of services and programs; and they expect educators to exhibit leadership and initiative in serving society as specialists trained in the organization and transmission of knowledge in ways that take into account the social and mental development of those who are learners.

Thank you.